

***Superintendent's Advisory Committee
Public Schools Accountability Act (PSAA) of 1999***

Minutes

Tuesday, April 23, 2002

1:00pm

Members Present:

Holly Covin, Co-chair, Assistant Executive Director, Policy Analysis and Research, CSBA
General Davie Jr., Co-chair, Superintendent, San Juan USD
Marilyn Buchi, President, CSBA
Ana Bertha Castellanos, Vice President, State Parent Advisory Council
Marc Ecker, Superintendent, Fountain Valley USD
Jerry Hayward, Co-director, PACE
Pam Kinsley, Teacher, Harding School
Lynette Nyaggah, Teacher, Rio Hondo College
Shelly Spiegel-Coleman, ESL Consultant, LA COE
Bernice Stafford, Vice President of School of Marketing and Evaluation, Lightspan, Inc.
Ting Sun, Natomas Charter School
Rosie Thompson, Business Unit Executive, IBM Global Education, IBM
Charles Weis, Superintendent, Ventura COE
Lynn Wilen, Retired Superintendent, Reef Sunset USD

Members Absent:

Eva Baker, Director, Center for the Study of Evaluation, UCLA
Vicki Barber, Superintendent, El Dorado COE
Tom Boysen, Chief Operating Officer, LAUSD
Mary Alice Callahan, President, Morgan Hill Federation of Teachers
Rudy Castruita, Superintendent, San Diego COE
Brian Edwards, Office of the Secretary for Education
Edward Haertel, Professor, Stanford University, School of Education
Lisa Horwitch, Senate Education Committee
Kelvin Lee, Superintendent, Dry Creek Joint ESD
Cecelia Mansfield, Vice President for Education, CA State PTA
Ernesto Ruiz, Director, Migrant Ed. Region 2, Butte COE
Jai Sookprasert, CSEA
Rene Townsend, Professor/Consultant, CSU, San Marcos College of Education

Principal Staff to the PSAA Advisory Committee:

William Padia, Director, Policy and Evaluation

Pat McCabe, Manager, EPIC

Wendy Harris, School Improvement Division

Sue Bennett, Manager, Education Options

General Davie Jr. called the meeting to order

Report on Integrating Results from the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE) into the 2002 Base Academic Performance Index (API) – Brian Stecher, Representative from the Technical Design Group

- Brian walked the committee through an Issue Paper entitled “The 2002 Base Academic Performance Index (API): Integrating the California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE) Results into the API.”
- This paper outlined six issues that the Technical Design Group (TDG) had examined and included their recommendations for each.
 - Issue #1: One Indicator versus Two – The committee agreed with the TDG’s recommendation to treat performance on the English-Language Arts and the Mathematics portion of the CAHSEE separately.
 - Issue #2: Which Students’ Results to Include – The committee requested that staff change the title of this issue to “Should 12th graders and students new to the district be included?” This change was requested so that inclusion or exclusion of other groups of students (e.g., EL) could be explored at a later date. The committee agreed with the TDG’s recommendation that scores of 12th grade students be included, but that scores of students new to the district would not.
 - Issue #3: Which Schools Receive This Indicator – The committee agreed with the TDG’s recommendation to add the CAHSEE as an indicator in all circumstances where there were valid test scores for at least 11 students, therefore not revealing the personal identity of any individual student. Schools that include multiple grade spans (e.g., 7-11) would have the CAHSEE included for their high school segment and their resultant API would be a weighted average of the API for each grade span.
 - Issue #4: Calculation of the Indicator – The TDG recommended that all test takers who pass the exam contribute a weighting factor of 1000 points to the indicator, regardless of their grade level. Tenth graders who fail the exam will contribute a weighting factor of 200 points toward the indicator, but Grade 11 and Grade 12 students who fail the exam will not count. The committee agreed with this recommendation.
 - Issue #5: The Weight of the CAHSEE in the Index – Four options were proposed by the TDG. The TDG recommended the option that preserved the weight of the content areas (40% for English-Language Arts and 20% for Math), and took weight away from the NRT. In this option, the NRT and the CAHSEE both receive the same weight (8% for the English-Language Arts cluster and 4% for the Math cluster). In reviewing these options, Chuck Weiss asked whether the TDG discussed

each weighting scheme in light of the public perception of the importance of each test or in light of the amount of instructional time devoted to each. After a short discussion, Chuck Weiss proposed a fifth option. Under option 5, the English-Language Arts cluster would be comprised of 24% CST, 6% NRT, and 10% CAHSEE. Similarly for Math, the cluster would be comprised of 12% CST, 3% NRT, and 5% CAHSEE. This option maintains the weight of each content area, but within content area, more weight is placed on the CAHSEE than on the NRT. The committee approved Option 5.

- Issue #6: The Treatment of Students Who Passed as Ninth Graders – This issue is important to the calculation of the 2002 Base API because last year's ninth graders were allowed to take the CAHSEE on a voluntary basis. Beginning with the spring 2002 test administration, only tenth grade students are allowed (required) to take this exam. In order to accommodate this one-time issue, the TDG recommended that the passing score of all ninth graders in 2001 be counted toward the 2002 Base API. The committee agreed with this recommendation.
- After the issues outlined in the paper were discussed, modified and approved, Shelly Spiegel-Coleman began a discussion about EL student performance on the CAHSEE. She expressed her concern about the low pass rate (17%) for EL students on the English-Language Arts portion of the CAHSEE. After a short discussion, Chuck Weiss proposed that staff study the 2002 performance of EL students on the CAHSEE and report back to the committee. The committee approved the recommendation. Staff will study the issue and report back to the committee after the data are available and analyses are conducted.

Report on the Activities of the Alternative Accountability Subcommittee– Lynn Wilen

- Wendell Callahan from the San Diego County Office of Education (SDCOE) provided an illustrative example of the proposed ASAM STAR Indicator based on 2001 STAR data for 'long-term' (90-day) students in SDCOE Juvenile Court and Community Schools. Each performance band on the NRT will be given a different weight than what is given under the traditional API system. Weights for this indicator under ASAM will range from 1000 to 2000 as opposed to the range of 200 to 1000 applied under the traditional API system. The different weights were assigned purposefully to place a greater emphasis on improvement in the low performance bands and to discourage comparisons between the STAR Indicators generated through ASAM and traditional APIs.
- Lynn Wilen reported out on four items. She asked for and received approval on the last three items from the larger committee.
 - Section 28 funds for this fiscal year: These federal funds were approved for CDE use earlier this month by the Legislature. Two proposals fall under the Alternative Accountability System. One is for a contractor to evaluate pre-post tests that may be used as indicators of performance for ASAM in 2003-2004 as well as to review baseline ASAM indicator data for 2001-2002 and develop recommendations for setting goals. The other is to hire a contractor to develop the CAPA test (California Alternate Performance Assessment) that will be used

for special education students in California. Both contacts have been released by the CDE.

- o Selection of a Third ASAM Indicator: As approved by the PSAA advisory committee, the Alternative Accountability subcommittee will request at the June SBE to delay requiring ASAM schools to select a third indicator from the 2002-2003 to the 2003-2004 school year. This one-year delay is necessitated by the delay in securing funding to conduct the review of pre-post tests.
- o Very Small Schools: As approved by the PSAA advisory committee, the subcommittee requests the TDG to work on the issue of “rolling up” test scores for ‘very small’ schools (those with less than 11 valid test scores). API’s and STAR Indicators for these schools would be calculated over a two- or three-year period, depending upon the length of time it takes for the school to exceed a total of 10 valid test scores. Once a very small school exceeds the 10 valid test score threshold, scores would be published with a designation indicating that the API or STAR Indicator is based upon aggregate test data from two or more years.

The subcommittee suggested that very small schools that serve traditional student populations should move back into the regular API System because ASAM was specifically designed for schools that serve at-risk student populations. The subcommittee would like to delay any further recommendation until the TDG has further explored the data issues.

ASAM indicator data for school year 2001-2002 will be collected from the hundreds of very small schools currently participating. The data reported to CDE by these schools in July 2002 will NOT be reported publicly unless, unlike previous years, it represents the participation of 11 or more students.

- o K-1 Schools: There are approximately 40 K-1 schools in California that do not receive API scores because only students in grade 2 through 11 are included in the Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) system. After considerable research about practices in other states and discussions with the field, the subcommittee recommended that the most feasible way to hold these schools accountable would be to “pair” them with one or more elementary schools that receive a majority of the K-1 students, for which we have test data.

The elementary school that receives the majority of the K-1 students would be designated by the district superintendent as the “receiving school”. This school’s API would be applied to the K-1 school. In cases where no school receives a majority of the K-1 student, a weighted API could be applied to the K-1 school based on the proportion of students that moved up to each receiving school. Rewards and interventions/sanctions for each receiving school would also be applied to the K-1 school. This proposal was approved by the PSAA committee and will be presented to the SBE for approval in the coming months.

Ms. Wilen shared committee documents that summarize the background information the subcommittee has considered in developing plans to provide accountability for very small schools and K-1 schools.

Report on the Activities of the Awards and Interventions Subcommittee– Holly Covin

- The Committee heard an update from Wendy Harris about the Scholastic Audit Teams fielded by CDE this past year and the School Assistance and Intervention Teams (SAIT) CDE needs to procure for next year. Last year these teams were comprised of CDE staff and, in some cases, county and district personnel. Thirteen schools in three districts were visited by the SAs for one week. Reports were generated by the SA and agreements were negotiated between the CDE and the district. In the fall of 2002, more schools will require this level of intervention, requiring more resources than the CDE has available. To build the capacity of the state, staff have developed a Request for Proposals (RFP) from potential providers of SAIT services. The subcommittee felt strongly about making the selection criteria for SAIT providers rigorous. Staff will continue working on the selection criteria and will provide periodic updates to the subcommittee.
- Holly Covin summarized the subcommittee a report on the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB). She outlined five main areas, which will evolve over the next several years.
 - Highly qualified teachers – The Department is working with the Governor’s Office, and other state agencies to operationalize “highly qualified teacher.”
 - Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) and the accountability system – Regulations on AYP aren’t expected until June at the earliest. Discussions are occurring within the CDE about the areas in which our current accountability system is aligned with NCLB and the areas in which we will need to adapt.
 - Intervention in low-performing schools – Of issue here is the alignment of our state interventions with the federal guidelines.
 - Data management – A longitudinal student tracking system is desired by the USDE, but the reality of such a system in California is likely years away. The California School Information Systems (CSIS) is voluntary and until such time that participation is mandatory we will not have sufficient data to track students over time, relying instead on yearly cross-sectional data.
 - English Learner issues and Title III – Many new requirements exist for Title III, including tracking of students in order to report on the English proficiency of EL students throughout the state.
- Ms. Covin also reported on SB1310 (Alpert), the clean-up bill on interventions currently making its way through the Legislature. This bill among other changes, outlines a change to the district mobility exclusion (adds more students to the system). Currently students are excluded from the accountability system if they were not enrolled in the district during the previous fiscal year. The new language would allow a student to be included in the system if they were enrolled in the district at the October CBEDS data collection date. This change would more closely align our system with the federal goals of including more students. This bill also clarifies the process by which sanctions are applied to schools after 24 months of implementation of II/USP.

Holly Covin adjourned the meeting at 2:50 p.m.